



Suite 210
1825 K Street
Washington D.C.
(202) 466-2419

STAT

June 27, 1984

STAT

[redacted]
Office of Public Affairs
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D. C. 20505

STAT

Dear [redacted]

184

A copy of the BNS article I mentioned in our telephone conversation this morning is attached. It is based on Mr. Casey's interview in the Legion Magazine, whose editor-in-chief, Jim Sites, gave us permission to use the material.

Since interview answers require some minor changes to be transformed into an op-ed page article, we do, of course, want to make sure the finished product meets with the approval of Mr. Casey and your office. Please feel free to make any changes you think advisable.

Our mailings go to the op-ed page editors of all 1,700 daily newspapers in the United States. We normally charge for the distribution, but we also like to include, from time to time, articles furnished in the public interest.

Examples of other articles we have distributed also are attached.

Our next mailing goes out early in the week. Assuming your changes are minor, I would very much appreciate your calling them in to me at the above number.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Clinton McCarty".

Clinton McCarty
Editor

Enclosures

Page Denied

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Denied

Byliner News Service

One 210 • 1825 K Street N.W. • Washington D.C. 20006-1237

AVAILABLE FOR PUBLICATION
UPON RECEIPT (2/15)

CONTACT: DICK LUKSTAT
(202) 466-6911

PRESIDENT'S PRIDE IN AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOWED THROUGH IN ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

By MAUREEN REAGAN

The evening of January 25 was very special for me. Like millions of Americans, I watched the President give his State of the Union address. But mine was the rare privilege of being there in the gallery while my father spoke.

I can't think of a time when I have been more proud of him or more proud of what he's accomplished. Proud of him because during the past three years he's had to stand unflinchingly in the face of all those who said it couldn't be done. Proud, too, of what he's been able to accomplish for us. It's almost hard to imagine now just how tough things were in 1981.

When he came into office, he found 21.5 percent interest rates that were devastating the country. Small businessmen and farmers were paying up to 25 percent for borrowed money just to maintain cash flow. Inflation was up over 15 percent and eating away our savings and retirements.

(more)

Maureen Reagan is special assistant to the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

2--Maureen Reagan

We were in dire straits. There were few people in this country who wouldn't tell you that the economy wasn't as bad as it could possibly be at that moment.

Obviously, the numbers look better today. Interest rates have been cut in half, inflation is down to under 4 percent per year and more and more Americans are rejoining the work force each day.

But the numbers don't tell the whole story. In January of 1981, there was no light at the end of the tunnel. Things weren't getting better; they were getting worse. There was nothing to look forward to. Now, at every quarter we look back and we can see things are much better.

In 1980, the American people wanted inflation stopped, interest rates brought down, our prestige restored and our industrial might rebuilt.

Nobody believed that we could do anything about inflation. Nobody believed we could cut interest rates in half. No one believed we could ever again be respected in the world. No one believed that today more and more Americans would be working every day.

Nobody except for this President.

Today, Americans are again respected in the world, our sick economy is on the mend and we are getting back to work. So now we are beginning to hear the doomsayers question whether the recovery has been fair.

(more)

3--Maureen Reagan

Every day, I talk to dozens and dozens of people. I have never met one who had a plan for economic recovery that would bring us all out of the mess we were in at the same time and at the same rate.

Today, as has always been the case, some Americans are better off than others. But the important point is that things are continuously getting better, and that means it's going to get better for everyone. That's why we all feel so much better about tomorrow.

I saw something in my father's eyes when he spoke that night. Others have told me they did, too. He was proud. Proud of the American people and what they have accomplished. Together we've accomplished a great deal.

And it's only going to get better and better.

(Distributed by Byliner News Service)

Byliner News Service

Suite 210 • 1825 K Street N.W. • Washington D.C. 20006 • (202) 466-2419

AVAILABLE FOR PUBLICATION
UPON RECEIPT (4/1)

CONTACT: JANE LESTER
(202) 456-6900

BARRING OF RFE/RL FROM WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES WAS PART OF SOVIETS' 'NEW INFORMATION ORDER'

By JAMES L. BUCKLEY

Most Americans may not have noticed when the International Olympic Committee decided to exclude Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty reporters from the 1984 Winter Olympics at Sarajevo, Yugoslavia.

But all Americans should be aware that this act was part of an unrelenting campaign by the Soviet Union to limit the scope of international journalism and foster what the Third World has embraced as a "new information order."

Why do they want it? Because, they say, news media in the industrialized democracies -- the United States in particular -- have acquired through their technology and drive an undue influence in the affairs of other countries. The premise is that Western media present images of other nations that are inconsiderate and unfair.

(more)

Mr. Buckley, a former U. S. senator from New York, is president of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, which broadcast to Communist bloc nations from West Germany, Spain and Portugal.

2--Mr. Buckley

It follows, from the logic of the new information order, that the state's right to control news originated abroad is superior to the right of its citizens to receive it. Nationality thus becomes a test of who is entitled to transmit news and information across frontiers.

Of course, that's completely contrary to the American idea of a free press. We believe that the more journalists there are -- all functioning independently -- the greater the chance for truth to be told. A reporter's passport is irrelevant to his right to cover news events.

The Soviets believe right and wrong are determined by the state, and reporters are essentially agents of the state.

The Soviet approach has proved popular with the governments of many developing countries. Let there be no mistake about it, however: The new information order they propose is an endorsement of state control. Its supporters would turn freedom of information into the freedom of every government to decide what its population is to see, hear and read.

Unknown to the vast majority of Americans, efforts to impose such a concept upon us all have been under way for years within the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). They also have been made within the Olympic movement.

The IOC has allowed itself to be persuaded that "too many" journalists have been accredited to cover past Olympic games.

(more)

3--Mr. Buckley

And that the quotas of those countries that generally send large contingents of reporters should be reduced, to achieve "better balance."

In short, the IOC has decided upon a new information order of its own, in which the countries with a large and active free press are to be constrained because other countries practice state control and have fewer newspapers and broadcasters.

Under the Olympic system, it is up to national committees to allocate whatever quotas are assigned to them by the IOC. In advance of Sarajevo, the U. S. Olympic Committee was able to give no broadcaster (with the exception of ABC, which had the contract) more than four accreditations.

RFE/RL, which broadcasts in 21 languages and reaches more than 50 million listeners a week, received two. It had 14 reporters and technicians at the previous winter olympics.

American broadcasters found a way around these constraints when the Yugoslav committee organizing the Sarajevo games agreed to make extra accreditations available. NBC and Mutual increased their allotments from four to 10 in this manner. The Voice of America raised its number from two to 18.

It was not until RFE/RL got approval from the Yugoslavs and the USOC to send 11 that the IOC stepped in. However, thanks to Soviet pressure, RFE/RL was singled out for special treatment, on the grounds that it was not qualified to receive accreditations because it broadcast exclusively to non-American audiences.

(more)

4--Mr. Buckley

This territorial litmus test, if allowed to stand, will no doubt be applied to others in the future, and to that degree it undermines the principles of the freedom of international broadcasting guaranteed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The campaign against RFE/RL has been going on since 1972, when the Soviet Union attempted unsuccessfully to keep RFE/RL reporters from covering the Munich Olympics. But they have never let up.

One Soviet IOC member, Vitaly Smirnov, acknowledged in an interview with the West German news agency DPA that he had launched this year's successful protest over the accreditation of RFE/RL.

A report in the March 5 issue of Sports Illustrated indicated that the Soviets even made RFE/RL an issue in negotiations over television rights for the Los Angeles Olympics.

The quota for American broadcasters at the Los Angeles Olympics will again be incredibly tight. And the Soviets will again try to sandbag RFE/RL.

No doubt they will again object on the grounds of territoriality. But their real objection is to the fact that RFE/RL effectively breaks state-controlled information monopolies in the Soviet Union.

They are using the Olympics, as they have used UNESCO, to impose new restrictions on the free flow of information, in which nationality becomes the test.

(Distributed by Byliner News Service)

Byliner News Service

AVAILABLE FOR PUBLICATION
UPON RECEIPT

CONTACT: ESTHER FOER
(202) 466-8320

RECOGNITION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS SPEEDS ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

By A. ALAN HILL

Can we get America's industries to intensify their environmental protection efforts? Yes, but not by laws alone.

The United States has on its statute books the world's most comprehensive environmental legislation. It has accomplished a great deal.

Since the Clean Water Act was passed, for example, 96 percent of all privately owned regulated facilities have come into full compliance with its requirements. The overall effect on water quality has been dramatic, for all that remains to be done. We've also made great progress toward cleaning up the air and the land.

But whatever legal requirements are placed on our companies, the essential ingredients of enthusiasm and imagination, vital for innovative and efficient solutions to environmental cleanup tasks, must spring from within the corporations themselves.

A. Alan Hill is chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality.

2--A. Alan Hill

We as a nation are likely to reach the beginning of the end of waste control problems when most firms are motivated more by a sense of pride and challenge than by the letter of the law.

One way to encourage extra effort is to recognize and honor those companies that, through application of enthusiasm and imagination, have attained noteworthy environmental results. Several industry groups have such honors programs.

Possibly the best known citations are the National Environmental Industry Awards, cosponsored by the President's Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Industry Council, an association of manufacturers offering pollution control systems and equipment.

We inaugurated our awards program in 1977. In the ensuing years we have cited worthy environmental efforts in many companies.

Among the best known winners have been Atlantic Cement, Deere & Co., Frito-Lay, Getty Synthetic Fuels, Goodyear, Martin Marietta, Uniroyal and Volvo.

The most recent awards, which I presented in a White House ceremony, went to Allied Corp., Colorado Joint Review Process, Bofors Nobel, Inc.'s Environmental Systems Corp., Homestake Mining Co., Miller Brewing Co. and Steelcase, Inc.

CEQ and EIC thought the awards program would be a good idea for two reasons. First, we felt we needed to reward firms that went the extra mile -- that were unusually innovative, setting

(more)

3--A. Alan Hill

new cleanup and prevention standards for others to emulate.

Second, we were interested in publicizing real-world cases in which engineering and technological advances initially developed to meet waste cleanup and prevention needs prove more cost-effective than the "old way" of doing things. These cases dispel the notion that environmental protection is never anything but an economic burden.

We've found worthy examples of both types of cases. Take first the matter of cost effectiveness. In 1979, we honored the Foil Division of Gould, Inc., for developing a system that virtually eliminates contaminated water discharge from its foil manufacturing plants.

The system recovers large quantities of copper and sulfuric acid, uses less energy, conserves water and improves operating efficiency. It cost about \$845,000 to design and install but saves the company half a million dollars a year. Many other examples of such cost savings could be cited.

The emphasis in cases of "going the extra mile" is more on responsibility than profitability. One of the most recent awards is a good example. The honored company was Swedish-owned Bofors Nobel, Inc., a Muskegon, Mich., specialty chemical firm.

The parent company bought the Muskegon plant as a going concern and had to deal with 370 million pounds of sludge the former owner had put in lagoons at the site. Leachate from the sludge had seeped through sandy soils and contaminated groundwater.

(more)

4--A. Alan Hill

Bofors set up a separate company, Environmental Systems Corporation, to be jointly operated by Bofors and two professional hazardous waste cleanup firms, Zimpro, Inc., and Chemical Waste Management, Inc.

Using an innovative coupling of existing technologies, ESC has pumped and treated about 1.2 million gallons of polluted groundwater per day. Several thousand gallons of manufacturing wastes are being detoxified daily. The treatment of both old and new manufacturing wastes continues with commendable efficiency.

We in the awards program have tried to recognize achievements in all aspects of environmental protection activity. An example is the recent award to Colorado Joint Review Process, a group consisting of Amax, Inc., and three government agencies.

The group developed a streamlined, cooperative review process to assure environmental protection in commercial projects. It is a shining example for other states.

Throughout the seven-year life of our awards program, we have been gratified by its beneficial effect on honored companies. There is ample evidence that morale of both management and employees has been boosted by the citations.

Praise is always a more satisfactory motivator than force. We should keep that in mind -- and pursue new avenues of recognition -- as we continue the vitally important task of cleaning up the nation's environment.

#

Byliner News Service

AVAILABLE FOR PUBLICATION
UPON RECEIPT (4/15)

CONTACT: FRED EILAND
(202) 523-4065

HOW'S THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
DOING? FINE, THANKS TO THE TAXPAYERS

By LEE ANN ELLIOTT

Do you ever wonder, as you fill out your income tax form,
how many people check the box that diverts a tax dollar into
the Presidential election campaign fund?

The number varies from year to year but averages about 25 percent of persons filing returns. The balance in the fund at the beginning of 1984 was \$177-million, and an estimated \$135-million will be paid out during this Presidential election year.

Federal matching funds are available to any Presidential candidate who raises \$5,000 in each of 20 states -- in contributions of \$250 or less.

As of April 16, 10 present or former candidates -- nine of them, of course, seeking the Democratic Presidential nomination -- have received federal matching funds: (more)

Mrs. Elliott, a Republican, is the Federal Election Commission chairwoman for 1984. The one-year chairmanship alternates between the two parties, each of which is represented on the FEC by three members. Each member's term in office is six years.

2--Lee Ann Elliott

Reubin Askew	\$897,533.71
Alan Cranston	\$1,740,029.86
John Glenn	\$2,926,473.20
Gary Hart	\$2,556,651.38
Earnest F. Hollings	\$769,067.94
Jesse Jackson	\$702,157.34
Lyndon H. Larouche	\$100,000.00
George McGovern	\$460,015.02
Walter F. Mondale	\$5,878,176.29
Ronald Reagan	\$7,406,560.89

Candidates asking for matching funds agree to spend no more than \$20.2-million in the primaries this year, which means the matching fund limit for those races is \$10.1-million. From present appearances, the limit will be reached by some candidates but must seem a misty dream for the 177 -- yes, 177 -- declared Presidential candidates not listed above.

A candidate is not required to accept any matching funds, and only candidates who do are subject to spending limits and mandatory FEC audits.

An interesting footnote to this year's campaign grew out of a rule that a candidate who establishes eligibility for matching funds can later lose it -- by receiving less than 10 percent of the vote in two consecutive primary elections.

That happened to the Rev. Jesse Jackson when he fell below 10 percent in the New Hampshire and Vermont primaries.

(more)

3--Lee Ann Elliott

But the rule goes on to say eligibility can be regained if the candidate wins 20 percent of the vote in a later primary. Rev. Jackson did that in Georgia and thus became the first candidate ever to requalify.

The FEC has paid the Democratic and Republican parties \$6,060,000 each to help defray national convention expenses.

Once nominees are chosen at those conventions, the financing scheme will change dramatically. Each nominee will receive a campaign block grant of \$40.4-million, and in accepting it he must agree not to spend a cent more -- not from his bank account, his family's, his friends' or those of his party's state campaign committees.

The Republican or Democratic National Committee, however, can spend up to an additional \$6.9-million on his behalf.

Candidates for the U. S. Senate and House of Representatives, like the Presidential candidates, must file regular reports with the FEC showing their campaign income and expenses. But they are not eligible for federal matching funds.

The Federal Election Campaign Act is working well. So is the commission it set up to oversee our election financing process.

(Distributed by Byliner News Service)